

REMARKS

Claims 1-6 are currently active.

The Examiner has allowed Claims 1-4 and objected to Claim 6. Claim 5 has been amended. Antecedent support for the amendment to Claim 5 is found in Claim 1. The Examiner has rejected Claim 5 as being obvious over Northrop. In view of the amendment to Claim 5, applicant respectfully traverses this rejection. Claim 5, as amended, has the limitation "so nourishment in the bowl has a tendency to move along the floor toward the apex under actions of the animal and gravity". The design patent of Northrop teaches the exact opposite. Under the action of the animal, the nourishment in the bowl would move away from the apex. Furthermore, the lid taught by Northrop blocks the animal from eating the nourishment from the direction that would cause the action of the animal to move the nourishment toward the apex. Accordingly, Claim 5, as amended, is not obvious from Northrop. Claim 6 is dependent to Claim 5 and is patentable for the reasons Claim 5 is patentable.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully requested that the outstanding rejections and objections to this application be reconsidered and withdrawn, and Claims 1-6, now in this application be allowed.

Respectfully submitted,

JAMES R. SAGE, JR.

By



Ansel M. Schwartz, Esquire
Reg. No. 30,587
One Sterling Plaza
201 N. Craig Street
Suite 304
Pittsburgh, PA 15213
(412) 621-9222

Attorney for Applicant

